



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/005,936	12/03/2001	Jinsaku Masuyama	016295.0733 (DC-03225)	7808
7590	04/26/2005			EXAMINER
Adam L. Stroud Baker Botts L.L.P. One Shell Plaza 910 Louisiana Houston, TX 77002-4995				CHEN, TSE W
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2116	
			DATE MAILED: 04/26/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action  
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief**

Application No.	10/005,936	Applicant(s) MASUYAMA ET AL.
Examiner	Tse Chen	Art Unit 2116

**--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --**

THE REPLY FILED 13 April 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.

1.  The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods:

a.  The period for reply expires \_\_\_\_\_ months from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 b.  The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than **SIX MONTHS** from the mailing date of the final rejection.  
 Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**NOTICE OF APPEAL**

2.  The Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a).

**AMENDMENTS**

3.  The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because  
 (a)  They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);  
 (b)  They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below);  
 (c)  They are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or  
 (d)  They present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: See Continuation Sheet. (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).

4.  The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324).  
 5.  Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.  
 6.  Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).  
 7.  For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a)  will not be entered, or b)  will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

**AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE**

8.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will not be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).  
 9.  The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will not be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome all rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).  
 10.  The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached.

**REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER**

11.  The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:  
See Continuation Sheet.  
 12.  Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). (PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_  
 13.  Other: \_\_\_\_\_.

  
**LYNNE H. BROWNE**  
**SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER**  
**TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100**

Continuation of 3. NOTE: Applicant raised new issues by amending the claims to include a startup. Further consideration and/or search is required to determine if the amendments are sufficient for patentability.

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: Applicant's arguments filed April 13, 2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

In re claims 1, 14, and 23, Applicant alleges that Tsurumi "is clearly directed to a method for performing a battery test... no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of sequencing power to server modules". Firstly, in response to applicant's arguments against the references individually, one cannot show nonobviousness by attacking references individually where the rejections are based on combinations of references. See In re Keller, 642 F.2d 413, 208 USPQ 871 (CCPA 1981); In re Merck & Co., 800 F.2d 1091, 231 USPQ 375 (Fed. Cir. 1986). In the instant case, Examiner reminds Applicant that the rejections were based on a combination of Smith, Bottom and Tsurumi to teach the sequential supply of power to start up a server module. In brief, Bottom taught the supplying of power to start up server modules [110; 0021]; and Tsurumi taught the sequential activation of [general] modules [power controller, battery; col.38, l.56 – col.39, l.17]. Secondly, it has been held that a prior art reference must either be in the field of applicant's endeavor or, if not, then be reasonably pertinent to the particular problem with which the applicant was concerned, in order to be relied upon as a basis for rejection of the claimed invention. See In re Oetiker, 977 F.2d 1443, 24 USPQ2d 1443 (Fed. Cir. 1992). In this case, Tsurumi clearly deals with the field of computer systems [col. 1, ll.10-30] and is involved with sequencing issues associated with unique addresses [col.38, ll.56-63]. Applicant alleges that Tsurumi "provides no disclosure, teaching or suggestion of calculating a start-up time for each server based on the unique address of each server module... instead, the timer of Tsurumi is set based upon the address of the associated power controller. Again, Examiner refers Applicant to the discussion above concerning arguing against the references individually. Examiner reminds Applicant that Tsurumi was cited to teach the calculating of a start-up time for each [general] module based on a unique address, and combined with the server module teachings of Smith and Bottom. Applicant alleges that Tsurumi "is clearly directed towards using batteries as a back-up..." The allegation has no relevance as Bottom was cited to teach the power supply while Tsurumi's batteries were indicated as one of the [general] modules.

In re claim 17, Applicant alleges that Examiner's rejection to claim 17 "fails to particularly address the use of a multiplication factor as recited ... see page 7, paragraph 34 [of the outstanding Office Action]". Examiner implores Applicant to read/review the outstanding Office Action in entirety and note that the Examiner did indeed address the use of a multiplication factor as recited... see page 8, paragraph 37.

All other claims were not argued separately.